



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,732	01/24/2001	Wayne W. Wang	13160US02	1228
7590 04/07/2004			EXAMINER	
Christopher C. Winslade			NGUYEN, CAO H	
McAndrews He 500 W. Madison	-		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Suite 3400			2173	
Chicago, IL 6	0661		DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004	/1
				. 1.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			PRG.
	Application N	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summany	09/768,732	WANG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
The SHALLING DATE of this committee of the	Cao (Kevin) Nguyen	2173	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		*	
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Fe 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final.		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the consequence of the second s	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date S Patent and Tradement Office.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/768,732

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al. (US Patent No. 6,643,652) in view of Adams et al. (US Patent No. 6,457,030 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Helgeson discloses an apparatus for the generation and application of a set of rules to transform source content into result content for a content receiving device, the apparatus comprising: a source content area for retrieving the source content; an analyzer for identifying separate elements within the source content and assigning an identifier to each element (see col. 49, lines 20-67 and col. 50, lines 1-67); a result content area providing selective placement of the elements according to a desired layout (see col. 53, lines 27-65); a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement (see col. 87, lines 31-65); however, Helgeson fails to explicitly teach an application device for applying the transformation rules to the source content that is requested by the content receiving device.

Adams teaches an application device for applying the transformation rules to the source content that is requested by the content receiving device (see col. 7, lines 10-67 and col. 8, lines 5-61). It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an application device for applying the transformation rules to the source

Application/Control Number: 09/768,732

Art Unit: 2173

content that is requested by the content receiving device as taught by Adams used in combination by Helgeson's managing data exchanging among system in a network in order to facilitate on demand Web content modification into a form suitable for presentation on pervasive computing device.

Regarding claim 2, Helgeson discloses wherein the source content area and result content area are part of a graphical editing tool (see col. 36, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 3, Helgeson discloses wherein editing tools provide for graphical placement of source content from the source content area into the result content area as result content (see col. 53, lines 28-45).

Regarding claim 4, Adams discloses wherein a storage device is used to store the transformation rules for access by the application device (see col. 8, lines 15-42 and col. 9, lines 6-34).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Adams discloses wherein the server device is a proxy server device that receives a request for source content, retrieves the source content from a corresponding web server device, and transforms the source content to result content according to the transformation rules (see figures 1A-4C).

Regarding claims 7-9, Helgeson discloses wherein the graphical editing tool is running on a design station device; and wherein the design station device is in communication with the application device in order to provide the transformation rules (see figures 6-10).

Claim 10, differs from claim 1 in that "at least one web site having web content information for display on the different web enabled devices; at least one proxy server device; at least one design station in communication with the at least one proxy server device; a web page

Art Unit: 2173

editor running on the at least one design station, whereby a source web page is retrieved and the layout of a result web page is formed according to the different device capabilities; and a rule generator associated with the web page editor for generating a set of transform rules to convert the source page to the result page, the transform rules being communicated to the at least one proxy server device, wherein the web enabled devices request information from the at least one web site through the at least one proxy server which applies the transform rules to the requested information." Which read on Adams (see col. 7, lines 38-67 and figures 1A-2).

As claims 14-26 are analyzed as previously discussed with respected to claims 1-10 above.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 703-308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/768,732

Art Unit: 2173

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

04/04/04